

III. REMARKS

Claims 1-31 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1, 9, 16 and 24 have been amended. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicants reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-5, 7, 16-20, 22, 24-28 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Bergamaschi *et al.* (Bergamaschi *et al.*, Semantic Integration of Semistructured and Structured Data Sources, SIGMOD Record, Vol. 28, No. 1, March 1999, pp. 54-59), hereafter “Bergamaschi,” in view of Squire (Squire, Cass, Data Extraction and Transformation for the Data Warehouse, ACM, SIGMOD, 1995, pp. 446-447), hereafter “Squire.” Claims 6, 8-15, 21, 23, 29 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Bergamaschi in view of Squire and further in view of Gorelik (U.S. Patent Pub. No.2005/0055369), hereafter “Gorelik.”

With regard to the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection over Bergamaschi in view of Squire, Applicants respectfully submit that references cited by the Office do not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention. For example, with respect to independent claims 1, 9, 16 and 24, Applicants submits that the cited references fail to teach or suggest a mining model schema. Bergamaschi teaches multiple heterogeneous information sources but does not teach or suggest that either of the sources is a mining model schema, i.e., acquired using a data mining application. Similarly, neither the old legacy application information nor the data warehouse of

Squire is taught as being acquired using a data mining application. Accordingly, the cited references do not teach or suggest the mining model schema of the claimed invention.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw its rejection.

With further respect to independent claims 1, 9, 16 and 24, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references also fail to teach or suggest matching by performing a number of matching processes in sequence until a match is found, wherein at least one of the number of matching processes does not utilize an external matching resource. In contrast, the automatic extraction of relationships of Bergamaschi is not taught as having multiple extraction steps. Furthermore, the extraction of Bergamaschi is done using an external source, to wit, a dictionary of terminological relationships. See e.g., page 54, col. 2, lines 13-15; and page 55, col. 2, section 1.1. To this extent, there is not a comparison step taught or suggested by Bergamaschi that does not use its common thesaurus. The claimed invention, in contrast, includes "...matching... by performing a number of matching processes in sequence until a match is found, wherein at least one of the number of matching processes does not utilize an external matching resource. Claim 1. As such, in contrast to Bergamaschi in which an external dictionary of terminological relationships is used in a single step, in the claimed invention matching is done by performing a number of matching processes in sequence until a match is found. Furthermore, at least one of these matching processes does not utilize an external matching resource. For the above reasons, automatic extraction of relationships of Bergamaschi does not teach or suggest the matching of the claimed invention. Squire does not cure this deficiency. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

With further respect to independent claims 1, 9, 16 and 24, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references also fail to teach or suggest transforming the data within the matching columns of the user data schema if the data type is determined to be different. The Office admits that Bergamaschi does not teach this feature, but instead relies on the transformation of data in Squire. This transformation is specified as having a number of functions, such as: reformatting data, recalculating data, modifying key structures of data, adding an element of time to data warehouse data, identifying default values of data, supplying logic to choose between multiple sources of data, summarizing data, tallying data, and merging data from multiple sources. However, none of the functions of Squire specifically deals with transforming data that is in one data type, such as string, to another data type, such as integer. Accordingly, Squire does not teach or suggest the transforming of data if the data type is determined to be different as included in the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw the rejection.

With respect to dependent claims, Applicants herein incorporate the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claims from which the claims depend. Furthermore, Applicants submit that all dependant claims are allowable based on their own distinct features. Since the cited art does not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

IV. CONCLUSION

In addition to the above arguments, Applicants submit that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicants do not

acquiesce to the Office's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. Additionally, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office's combinations and modifications of the various references or the motives cited for such combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Office's combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicants reserve the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Hunter E. Webb
Reg. No.: 54,593

Date: August 3, 2006

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)

RAD/hew